

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

KEITH E. ANDERSON, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. CR02-423C

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Keith E. Anderson's Motion to Compel Court Clerk to Produce Necessary Documentation for Appeal (Dkt. No. 1171). Defendant requests an order directing the Clerk to provide him with the trial transcript, a list of the exhibits he introduced at trial, and a copy of the local rules for the Ninth Circuit. He also requests that the Clerk change his name on all court records. The Court has carefully reviewed the papers Defendant has submitted and hereby finds and rules as follows:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 753(f), the United States must provide transcripts, at its expense, to a defendant who is proceeding under the Criminal Justice Act ("CJA") or, in certain circumstances, is proceeding *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"). If a defendant is not proceeding under the CJA or as IFP, but he has made a proper showing of need, the Court may order that the defendant receive a copy of the trial

1 transcript at the Government's expense. Defendant is not proceeding under the CJA, and he has not filed
2 a request to proceed IFP on appeal. Further, although Defendant provides the Court with a record of his
3 prison account, he does not explain whether he has other funds available to him. Thus, he has not made
4 the requisite showing of need. Accordingly, the Court hereby DENIES Defendant's request for an order
5 compelling the Clerk to provide a copy of the trial transcript to him at the Government's expense.

6 Defendant's other requests are also improper. The Clerk is under no obligation to provide
7 Defendant with a list of the exhibits he offered into evidence at trial or to change the way his name
8 appears on court documents. Additionally, Defendant may receive a copy of the Ninth Circuit Rules, free
9 of charge, by sending a written request to the Office of the Clerk for the Ninth Circuit.

10 Defendant's motion is hereby DENIED.

11
12 SO ORDERED this 26th day of July, 2005.

13
14 
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25